

Entropy of Partitions on Sequential Effect Algebras ^{*}

Wang Jiamei[†], Wu Junde[‡], Cho Minhyung[§]

Abstract By using the sequential effect algebra theory, we establish the partitions and refinements of quantum logics and study their entropies.

Key Words: Sequential effect algebra, Boolean algebra, entropy.

PACS numbers: 02.10-v, 02.30.Tb, 03.65.Ta.

1. Introduction

Quantum entropy or *Von Neumann entropy*, which is a counterpart of the classical *Shannon entropy*, is an important subject in quantum information theory ([1]). In order to study the entropy of *partition* of *quantum logics*, in [2], the author tried to define the partitions and *refinements* of quantum logics, nevertheless, his methods are only suitable for *classical logics*, the essential reasons are that the classical logics satisfy the *distributive law* but quantum logics do not. In this paper, by using the *sequential effect algebra* theory, we establish really effective refinement methods of quantum logics and study their entropies.

2. Classical logics and quantum logics

As we know, the classical logics can be described by the Boolean algebras and the quantum logics can be described by the orthomodular lattices ([2-5]). The classical probability or Shannon entropy was based on the classical logics and quantum en-

^{*}This project is supported by Research Fund of Kumoh National Institute of Technology.

[†]Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, People's Republic of China.

[‡]Corresponding author: Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, People's Republic of China. E-mail: wjd@zju.edu.cn

[§]Department of Applied Mathematics, Kumoh National Institute of Technology, Kyungbuk 730-701, Korea. E-mail: mignon@kumoh.ac.kr

tropy was established on the quantum logics ([1]). Now, we recall some elementary notions and conclusions of Boolean algebras and the orthomodular lattices.

Let $(L, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. If for any $a, b \in L$, its infimum $a \wedge b$ and supremum $a \vee b$ exist, then $(L, \leq)$ is said to be a *lattice*. If $(L, \leq)$ is a lattice and for any $a, b, c \in L$, we have

$$a \wedge (b \vee c) = (a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c), \quad (1)$$

$$a \vee (b \wedge c) = (a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c), \quad (2)$$

then we say that $(L, \leq)$ satisfies the *distributive law*. Let $(L, \leq)$ be a lattice with the largest element I and the smallest element θ . If there exists a mapping $' : L \rightarrow L$ such that for each $a \in L$, $a \vee a' = I$, $a \wedge a' = \theta$, $(a')' = a$ and $b' \leq a'$ whenever $a \leq b$, then $(L, \leq)$ is said to be an *orthogonal complement lattice*. Let $(L, \leq)$ be an orthogonal complement lattice. If $a, b \in L$ and $a \leq b$, we have

$$b = a \vee (b \wedge a'), \quad (3)$$

then we say that $(L, \leq)$ satisfies the *orthomodular law*.

Definition 2.1 Let $(L, \leq)$ be an orthogonal complement lattice. If $(L, \leq)$ satisfies the distributive law, then $(L, \leq)$ is said to be a Boolean algebra; if $(L, \leq)$ satisfies the orthomodular law, then $(L, \leq)$ is said to be an orthomodular lattice.

Example 2.1 Let X be a set and 2^X be its all subsets. Then $(2^X, \subseteq)$ is a Boolean algebra.

Example 2.2([4-5]) Let H be a complex Hilbert space, $P(H)$ be the set of all orthogonal projection operators on H , $P_1, P_2 \in P(H)$. If we define $P_1 \leq P_2$ if and only if $P_1 P_2 = P_2 P_1 = P_1$, then $(P(H), \leq)$ is an orthomodular lattice.

Example 2.2 is the most important and famous quantum logic model which was introduced in 1936 by Birkhoff and von Neumann ([4]).

Let $(L, \leq)$ be an orthomodular lattice and $a, b \in L$. If $a \leq b'$, then we say that a and b are orthogonal and denoted by $a \perp b$. A subset $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ of L is said to be an orthogonal set if $a_1 \perp a_2, (a_1 \vee a_2) \perp a_3, \dots, (a_1 \vee a_2 \vee \dots \vee a_{n-1}) \perp a_n$.

Let $(L, \leq)$ be an orthomodular lattice and $s : L \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a mapping from L into the real number interval $[0, 1]$. If $s(I) = 1$ and $s(a \vee b) = s(a) + s(b)$ whenever $a \perp b$, then s is said to be a state of $(L, \leq)$.

It is clear that if s is a state of $(L, \leq)$ and $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ is a finite orthogonal subset of L , then $s(\vee_{i=1}^n a_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n s(a_i)$.

In [2], the author defined the following three concepts:

Let $(L, \leq)$ be an orthomodular lattice and s be a state of $(L, \leq)$, $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be a finite orthogonal subset of L . If $s(\bigvee_{i=1}^n a_i) = 1$, then $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ is said to be a partition of $(L, \leq)$ with respect to the state s . If $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ is a partition of $(L, \leq)$ with respect to the state s and for each $b \in L$,

$$s(b) = \sum_{i=1}^n s(a_i \wedge b),$$

then s is said to have the *Bayes property*. Moreover, let $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m\}$ be two partitions of $(L, \leq)$ with respect to the state s . Then the set $\{a_i \wedge b_j : i = 1, 2, \dots, n; j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is said to be a refinement of the partitions $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m\}$.

By the distributive law of Boolean algebra, it is clear that each state on the Boolean algebra has the Bayes property. However, the following example shows that there is no state s on $(P(H), \leq)$ with the Bayes property, where H is a complex Hilbert space with $\dim(H) = 2$. Moreover, our example shows also that the concept of refinement of partitions is also not effective for $(P(H), \leq)$.

Example 2.3 Let H be a complex Hilbert space with $\dim(H) = 2$ and $a_1 = \{(0, z) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$, $a_2 = \{(z, 0) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$. If P_1, P_2 are the orthogonal projection operators from H onto a_1 and a_2 , respectively, then for any state s , $A = \{P_1, P_2\}$ is a partition of $(P(H), \leq)$ with respect to state s . Let $b_1 = \{(\frac{\sqrt{2}z}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}z}{2}) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$, $b_2 = \{(-\frac{\sqrt{2}z}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}z}{2}) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$ and Q_1, Q_2 are the orthogonal projection operators on b_1 and b_2 , respectively. Then $P_i \wedge Q_j = 0, i, j = 1, 2$. So $\bigvee_{i=1}^n (P_i \wedge Q_j) = 0, j = 1, 2$. If state s has the Bayes property, then we have $s(Q_j) = s(0) = 0, j = 1, 2$, so $s(Q_1) + s(Q_2) = 0$. On the other hand, note that $Q_1 \perp Q_2$ and $Q_1 \vee Q_2 = I$, so $1 = s(I) = s(Q_1) + s(Q_2) = 0$, this is a contradiction and so there is no state s on $(P(H), \leq)$ which has the Bayes property. Moreover, since $P_i \wedge Q_j = 0, i, j = 1, 2$, so $\{P_i \wedge Q_j : i, j = 1, 2\}$ cannot be considered as a refinement of two partitions $\{P_1, P_2\}$ and $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$.

Example 2.3 told us that we must redefine the refinement concept of partitions of quantum logics.

In quantum theory, we have known that each orthogonal projection operator can be looked as the *sharp measurement*. For two sharp measurements P and Q , if P is performed first and Q second, then PQP have important physics meaning ([6-8]). If $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$ and $\{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m\}$ are two orthogonal sets of $(P(H), \leq)$

and $\bigvee_{i=1}^n P_i = I$, $\bigvee_{i=1}^m Q_i = I$, then we may try to use

$$\{Q_j P_i Q_j, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, i = 1, 2, \dots, n; j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$$

as the refinement of $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$ and $\{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_m\}$. However, note that, in general, $Q_j P_i Q_j$ is not an orthogonal projection operator on H , that is, $Q_j P_i Q_j \notin P(H)$, so we must transfer the sharp measurements to unsharp measurements. In 1994, Foulis and Bennett completed the famous transformation, that is, they introduced the following algebra structure and called it as the *effect algebra* ([9]):

Let $(E, \theta, I, \oplus)$ be an algebra system, where θ and I be two distinct elements of E , $\oplus$ be a partial binary operation on E satisfying that:

(EA1) If $a \oplus b$ is defined, then $b \oplus a$ is defined and $b \oplus a = a \oplus b$.

(EA2) If $a \oplus (b \oplus c)$ is defined, then $(a \oplus b) \oplus c$ is defined and

$$(a \oplus b) \oplus c = a \oplus (b \oplus c).$$

(EA3) For every $a \in E$, there exists a unique element $b \in E$ such that $a \oplus b = I$.

(EA4) If $a \oplus I$ is defined, then $a = \theta$.

In an effect algebra $(E, \theta, I, \oplus)$, if $a \oplus b$ is defined, we write $a \perp b$. For each $a \in E$, it follows from (EA3) that there exists a unique element $b \in E$ such that $a \oplus b = I$, we denote b by a' . Let $a, b \in E$, if there exists an element $c \in E$ such that $a \perp c$ and $a \oplus c = b$, then we say that $a \leq b$. It follows from [9] that $\leq$ is a partial order of $(E, 0, 1, \oplus)$ and satisfies that for each $a \in E$, $0 \leq a \leq 1$, $a \perp b$ if and only if $a \leq b'$. If $a \wedge a' = 0$, then a is said to be a *sharp element* of E .

Let H be a complex Hilbert space. A self-adjoint operator A on H such that $0 \leq A \leq I$ is called a *quantum effect* on H ([6-9]). If a quantum effect represents a measurement, then the measurement may be *unsharp* ([6, 9]). The set of quantum effects on H is denoted by $E(H)$. For $A, B \in E(H)$, if we define $A \oplus B$ if and only if $A + B \leq I$ and let $A \oplus B = A + B$, then $(E(H), \theta, I, \oplus)$ is an effect algebra, and its all sharp elements are just $P(H)$ ([5-6, 9]).

Moreover, Professor Gudder introduced and studied the following *sequential effect algebra* theory ([10-11]):

Let $(E, \theta, I, \oplus)$ be an effect algebra and another binary operation $\circ$ defined on $(E, \theta, I, \oplus)$ satisfying that

(SEA1) The map $b \mapsto a \circ b$ is additive for each $a \in E$, that is, if $b \perp c$, then $a \circ b \perp a \circ c$ and $a \circ (b \oplus c) = a \circ b \oplus a \circ c$.

(SEA2) $I \circ a = a$ for each $a \in E$.

(SEA3) If $a \circ b = \theta$, then $a \circ b = b \circ a$.

(SEA4) If $a \circ b = b \circ a$, then $a \circ b' = b' \circ a$ and for each $c \in E$, $a \circ (b \circ c) = (a \circ b) \circ c$.

(SEA5) If $c \circ a = a \circ c$ and $c \circ b = b \circ c$, then $c \circ (a \circ b) = (a \circ b) \circ c$ and $c \circ (a \oplus b) = (a \oplus b) \circ c$ whenever $a \perp b$.

Let $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$ be a sequential effect algebra. If $a, b \in E$ and $a \circ b = b \circ a$, then we say that a and b is *sequentially independent* and denoted by $a|b$.

Now, we use the sequential effect algebra theory as tools to study the partitions and refinements of quantum logics and their entropies.

3. Partitions, refinements and their entropies

Let $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$ be a sequential effect algebra. A set $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ is said to be a partition of $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$ if $\oplus_{i=1}^n a_i$ is defined and $\oplus_{i=1}^n a_i = I$.

In following, we denote partitions $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$, $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m\}$, $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_l\}$, and $A \circ B = \{a_i \circ b_j : a_i \in A, b_j \in B, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$. That $A \circ B \neq B \circ A$ are clear.

Let $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$ be a sequential effect algebra, A and B be two partitions of $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$. Then it follows from (SEA1) and ([11, Lemma 3.1(i)]) that $A \circ B = \{a_i \circ b_j : a_i \in A, b_j \in B, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, j = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ is also a partition of $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$. We say that the partition $A \circ B$ is a refinement of the partitions A and B .

Example 3.1([11]) Let $(L, \leq)$ be a Boolean algebra, $a, b \in L$. Let $a \oplus b$ be defined iff $a \wedge b = \theta$, in this case, $a \oplus b = a \vee b$, and define $a \circ b = a \wedge b$. Then $(L, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$ is a sequential effect algebra.

Example 3.2([11]) Let X be a set and $\mathcal{F}(X)$ be the all fuzzy sets of X , $\mu_{\bar{A}}, \mu_{\bar{B}} \in \mathcal{F}(X)$. Let $\mu_{\bar{A}} \oplus \mu_{\bar{B}}$ be defined iff $\mu_{\bar{A}} + \mu_{\bar{B}} \leq 1$, in this case, $\mu_{\bar{A}} \oplus \mu_{\bar{B}} = \mu_{\bar{A}} + \mu_{\bar{B}}$, and define $\mu_{\bar{A}} \circ \mu_{\bar{B}} = \mu_{\bar{A}} \mu_{\bar{B}}$. Then $(\mathcal{F}(X), 0, 1, \oplus, \circ)$ is a sequential effect algebra.

Example 3.3([11]) Let H be a complex Hilbert space, if for any two quantum effects B and C , we define $B \circ C = B^{\frac{1}{2}} C B^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then $(\mathcal{E}(H), 0, I, \oplus, \circ)$ is a sequential effect algebra. In particular, for any two orthogonal projection operators P and Q on H , $PQP = P^{\frac{1}{2}} Q P^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a sequential product of P and Q .

The above three examples showed that our refinement methods of the partitions are not only suitable for classical logics, but also effective for fuzzy logics and quantum logics.

Now, we begin to study the entropies of partitions and refinements of sequential effect algebras. First, we need the following:

Let $(E, \theta, I, \oplus, \circ)$ be a sequential effect algebra, s be a state of $(E, 0, 1, \oplus, \circ)$, that is, $s : E \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a mapping from E into the real number interval $[0, 1]$ such that $s(I) = 1$ and whenever $a \oplus b$ be defined, $s(a \oplus b) = s(a) + s(b)$. Then for given A ,

$$s_A : b \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n s(a_i \circ b)$$

defines a new state s_A , this is the resulting state after the system A is executed but no observation is performed ([12]). Moreover, we denote $s(b | a)$ by $s(a \circ b)/s(a)$ if $s(a) \neq 0$ and 0 if $s(a) = 0$.

The entropy of A with respect to the state s is defined by

$$H_s(A) = - \sum_{i=1}^n s(a_i) \log s(a_i).$$

The *refinement entropy* of A and B with respect to the state s is defined by

$$H_s(A \circ B) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m s(a_i \circ b_j) \log s(a_i \circ b_j).$$

The *conditional entropy* of B conditioned by A with respect to the state s is defined by

$$H_s(B|A) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m s(a_i \circ b_j) \log s(b_j|a_i).$$

Lemma 3.1([13]) (*log sum inequality*) For non-negative numbers $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ and $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \log \frac{a_i}{b_i} \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right) \log \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i} \right).$$

We use the convention that $0 \log 0 = 0$, $a \log \frac{a}{0} = \infty$ if $a > 0$ and $0 \log \frac{0}{0} = 0$.

In this paper, our main result is the following theorem which generalizes the classical entropy properties ([2, 13-14]) to the sequential effect algebras.

Theorem 3.1 (i). $H_s(A \circ B) = H_s(B|A) + H_s(A)$.

(ii). $H_s(A|C) \leq H_s(A \circ B|C)$.

(iii). $H_s(B|A) \leq H_{s_A}(B)$.

(iv). $H_s(A \circ B) \leq H_s(A) + H_{s_A}(B)$.

(v). $\max\{H_{s_A}(B), H_s(A)\} \leq H_s(A \circ B)$.

(vi). $H_s(B \circ A|C) \leq H_{s_C}(A|B) + H_s(B|C)$.

Proof. We only prove (vi). In fact, by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_{s_C}(A|B) + H_s(B|C) \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m s_C(b_j \circ a_i) \log s_C(a_i|b_j) - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ b_j) \log s(b_j|c_k) \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ (b_j \circ a_i)) \log \frac{\sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ (b_j \circ a_i))}{\sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ b_j)} \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ b_j) \log \frac{s(c_k \circ b_j)}{s(c_k)} \\
&\geq - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ (b_j \circ a_i)) \log \frac{s(c_k \circ (b_j \circ a_i))}{s(c_k \circ b_j)} \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ b_j) \log \frac{s(c_k \circ b_j)}{s(c_k)} \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^l s(c_k \circ (b_j \circ a_i)) \log \frac{s(c_k \circ (b_j \circ a_i))}{s(c_k)} \\
&= H_s(B \circ A|C).
\end{aligned}$$

That concludes the proof.

Finally, we would like to point out that for the advances of sequential effect algebras, see [15-18].

References

- [1] Ohya M. and Petz D. *Quantum Entropy and its Use*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1991)

- [2] Yuan Hejun. J. Entropy of Partitions on Quantum Logic. Commun. Theor. Phys. **43**, 437-439, (2005)
- [3] Kelly J. L. *General Topology*. Springer-Verlag, New York, (1955)
- [4] Birkhoff G. and von Neumann J. The logic of quantum mechanics, Ann. Math. **37**, 823-834, (1936)
- [5] Dvurečenskij A. and Pulmannová S. *New Trends in Quantum Structures*. Kluwer, (2002)
- [6] Busch P., Grabowski M. and Lahti P. J. *Operational Quantum Physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1995)
- [7] Busch P., Lahti P. J. and Mittelstaedt P. *The Quantum Theory of Measurements*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (1991)
- [8] Busch P. and Singh J. Lüders theorem for unsharp quantum measurements. Phys. Lett. A. **249**, 10-12, (1998)
- [9] Foulis D. J. and Bennett M. K. Effect algebras and unsharp quantum logics. Found. Phys. **24**, 1331-1352, (1994)
- [10] Gudder S. and Nagy G. Sequential quantum measurements. J. Math. Phys. **42**, 5212-5222, (2001)
- [11] Gudder S. and Greechie R. Sequential products on effect algebras. Rep. Math. Phys. **49**, 87-111, (2002)
- [12] Arias A., Gheondea A. and Gudder S. Fixed points of quantum operations. J. Math. Phys. **43**, 5872-5881, (2002)
- [13] Cover T. M. and Thomas J. A. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley, New York, (1991)
- [14] Zhao Yuexu and Ma Zhihao. Conditional Entropy of Partitions on Quantum Logic. Commun. Theor. Phys. **48**, 11-13 (2007)
- [15] Shen Jun and Wu Junde. Not each sequential effect algebra is sharply dominating. Phys. Letter A. **373**, 1708-1712, (2009)
- [16] Shen Jun and Wu Junde. Remarks on the sequential effect algebras. Report. Math. Phys. **63**, 441-446, (2009)
- [17] Liu Weihua and Wu Junde. A uniqueness problem of the sequence product on operator effect algebra $\mathcal{E}(H)$. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 185206-185215, (2009)
- [18] Shen Jun and Wu Junde. Sequential product on standard effect algebra $\mathcal{E}(H)$. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44**, (2009)